



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/029,583

12/20/2001

Theodore I. Kamins

10018774-1

4949

7590 05/25/2007  
HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY  
Intellectual Property Administration  
P.O. Box 272400  
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER

MCDONALD, RODNEY GLENN

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1753

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

05/25/2007

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE****U.S. Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

APPLICATION NO./ CONTROL NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR / PATENT IN REEXAMINATION	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
---------------------------------	-------------	---	---------------------

EXAMINER
----------

ART UNIT	PAPER
----------	-------

20070525

DATE MAILED:

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

**Commissioner for Patents**

The reply brief filed March 20, 2007 has been entered and considered. The application has been forwarded to the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences for decision on the appeal.

It should be noted that Appellant has not provided any new arguments as discussed below.

Appellant in their appeal brief already presented the argument that a semiconductor device is not equivalent to a molecular electronic device on page 12 of their Brief. Furthermore Appellant in their appeal brief on Page 12 already presented the argument that a capacitive device and a tunnel barrier device are not equivalent and that all barriers are equal. The Examiner specifically addressed these arguments in his Examiner's Answer on page 13 and maintains his position.

Rodney G. McDonald  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit: 1753